Niveau(x) d'enseignement: 0 Numéro EDUQ : 8270581
Centre d'intérêt: 250

A Survey of the Jewish community of Montréal : report / directed by Morton Weinfeld, William W. Eaton ; commissioned by the Jewish Community Research Institute of Montréal. -- Montréal : Jewish Community Research Institute of Montréal, 1979.
86 f. ; 28 cm.

Faux-titre: The Jewish community of Montréal : survey report.
Bibliographie: f. 86.

Cote Dewey: 305.8'924'071428/S963 Cote LC: FC/2950/.J5

Descripteur(s): *Groupe ethnique *Caractéristiques socio-économiques *Milieu culturel *Ressources communautaires *Participation communautaire *Attitude politique *Attitude sociale

Identificateur(s) de sujet: *Ecole de jour *Communauté juive *Juifs

Présentation des résultats d'une enquête sociologique menée auprès des membres de la communauté juive montréalaise. Trois aspects sont particulièrement abordés: 1. les caractéristiques socio-démographiques (âge, sexe, données linguistiques et occupationnelles, etc.); 2. l'intégration au sein de la communauté juive (pratiques religieuses et culturelles, participation à des organismes ou à des activités communautaires, etc.); 3. les attitudes en ce qui concerne l'évolution socio-politique du Québec. L'aspect éducationnel est particulièrement pris en considération.

L'enquête portait non pas sur l'ensemble de la population montréalaise d'origine juive, mais sur les seules personnes effectivement impliquées au sein de la communauté juive. A partir de listes fournies par divers organismes, 35739 familles ont ainsi été repérées et un échantillon aléatoire de 1000 familles a été constitué. A l'automne 1978, les chefs de ces familles ont été rencontrés à domicile et un questionnaire comprenant 332 questions leur a été soumis. Au total, 657 personnes ont accepté de se prêter à l'enquête.

L'essentiel du volume consiste en une présentation détaillée des données recueillies. Certains points sont particulièrement abordés: la question des "day schools" (écoles de jour), de leur financement et de la part qui devrait y être accordée à l'enseignement du français; celle de l'intégration à l'intérieur de la société québécoise et des manifestations d'antisémitisme; les attitudes face au référendum et à la situation politique, mises en relation avec l'intention de demeurer au Québec ou d'immigrer.

Type de document: r
Région(s) administrative(s): 063
Auteur de l'analyse: ar

E 0 0 0 8270581

Report: a survey of the Jewish community of Montreal.

Morton Wisnfeld
William Caton

E D U Q 8270581

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF MONTREAL:

SURVEY REPORT

1979

R E P O R T :

A SURVEY OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF MONTREAL.

Directed by

Dr. Morton Weinfeld
Dept. of Sociology
McGill University

Dr. William W. Eaton
National Institute of Mental Health
Washington, D.C.

Commissioned by the Jewish Community Research Institute of Montreal.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	3
Definition and Construction of the Universe	3
Drawing and Verifying the Sample	9
The Questionnaire	12
FIELDWORK	16
Recruitment of Interviewers	16
Review of the Fieldwork	17
RESULTS	21
General Background	22
Jewish Background	34
Contemporary Issues and Attitudes	52
Analysis of Emigration	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86

PREFACE

This Report is designed to describe the methodology of a survey of Jewish household heads in Montreal, and to present an overview of the data which were obtained. The results of the survey, which involved 332 questions yielding over 500 computer variables, are available on computer tape for additional analysis. All of the many issues raised in this Report may be clarified with further, more detailed, analysis of the data. It is our hope that such analysis will be undertaken by both representatives of Jewish communal organizations and interested scholars and students, and will be facilitated through a policy of wide accessibility to and dissemination of the survey data.

Many people contributed to the successful completion of the survey: Dr. Jack Kantrowitz of The Jewish Community Research Institute, Dr. George Kantrowitz of the Allied Jewish Community Services, Mr. Claude Gauthier and Ms. Joanne Dignard of the Centre de Recherche sur l'Opinion Publique. Mr. Melvin Niederhoffer assisted in the construction of the master list, and Ms. Sophie Bleeker assisted in the construction of the questionnaire.

Many others participated, and unfortunately we cannot list them all. We acknowledge their efforts and thank them for their assistance.

Morton Weinfeld

William W. Eaton

INTRODUCTION

The study described in this report was designed to fulfill two broad tasks. The first was to undertake a comprehensive survey of the Jewish Community, which would serve as a rich data base for research and analysis. The data were to yield information on a variety of topics of both scientific, planning, and policy-making importance. The second task was to determine the collective opinions of Jewish community members with regard to current social and political developments in the province of Quebec. The methodology employed was that of a survey of a representative sample of Jewish household heads, using a questionnaire instrument administered in face to face interviews.

The type of information collected can be classified into three types. First, there are the extensive socio-demographic data, describing the age, sex, occupational, linguistic and many other background characteristics of the sample. Second, there are questions concerning the Jewish background of the respondents and their families, indicating beliefs and practices of the community in the religious, cultural, and communal domains. Third, is the area of attitudes on topical socio-political issues in Quebec.

Until this time, no comparable systematic survey of the community has been taken. Most large Jewish communities in North America have completed large-scale surveys, to serve as a basis for research and an aid to Jewish communal planning. In the design of this survey, the research directors have reaped the benefits of earlier efforts in

other Jewish communities, drawing from those surveys features of design and questionnaire construction which were most successful in the past. Given the changing circumstances in Quebec in the past few years, the current value of such a survey is substantial.

The survey will serve a variety of purposes. One use is to present to the decision-making leadership of the Jewish community a picture of community preferences on a number of issues. A profile of community public opinion is invaluable as an element of a representative and responsive decision-making process. In addition, application of the data for planning uses is virtually unlimited. There is practically no sector of organized Jewish life which might not benefit from the available material. Data on the size and shape of the community may help determine planning priorities. Various sections of the survey shed light on specific planning areas, including care for the aged, provision of immigrant services, Jewish education, programming for youth, understanding the role of Israel, health, religious and cultural patterns, philanthropic patterns, etc.

A long term purpose is the enrichment of Jewish scholarship. The survey provides information on sub-samples of holocaust survivors, on Sephardim and Ashkenazim, on the attitudinal and behavioral bases of Jewish identity, on the structure of economic life of Montreal Jewry, and many other topics. The availability of this data will enable scholars and researchers to understand fully both unique characteristics of Jewish life in Montreal, and general patterns throughout North America.

METHODOLOGY

Definition and Construction of the Universe

The first task was to define precisely who was to be included under the rubric "Jewish community." "Community" implies active participation and interaction in the group, and thus, Jewish persons involved in any Jewish groups, functions, or organizations were to be included. The definitions of "active participation and interaction" and "Jewish groups, functions or organizations" were as broad as possible to include as many persons as possible. As evidence of participation a wide variety of membership lists were used, as described below.

The decision to represent the Jewish community in this manner omits certain groups that might be included in other definitions of the Jewish community, such as the "Jewish ethnic" or "Jewish religion" questions of the census of Canada. This definition is less likely to include assimilated Jews—that is, those persons of Jewish descent who have no other contact with the Jewish community than the census, where the definition of Jewish ethnicity includes those with a Jewish ancestor on the paternal side. This definition is also less likely than the census definition to include certain Hasidic groups, who, are isolated from other segments of the Jewish community. Thirdly, this definition may theoretically exclude Jewish persons who "feel" very Jewish, but who have no discoverable connection to the formal organizational life of the community. Finally, this definition is less likely than the census definition to include young persons who have very recently formed their own households. Special efforts and methodologies were

attempted in order to correct the anticipated deficiencies where possible in the latter three cases.

It is important to stress again that this is a survey of the Jewish "community", not of all Jews - or people of Jewish origin - in Montreal. From a sociological perspective, the latter definition would be more appealing, as it is a group such as the "assimilated" Jews which might be of great scientific interest. Practical considerations, as well as theoretical, guided our definition of the universe of the study. It was felt that the great majority of Jews in Montreal were in fact linked in some way to the formal community. Thus the expense of time, effort, and resources needed to find such marginal persons might not be warranted in terms of eventual yield. Moreover, it was felt that any important planning decisions to be made regarding community priorities and specific service agencies might best be made with the help of data drawn from a sample of supporters or users of these services.

It was decided to let household heads, not individuals, represent the community in the study. The household is a common unit of analysis in demography, as are individuals. One reason for this decision was that household heads can provide information about themselves as well as about the other members of the household. Also, it is more practical to survey household heads because membership lists often refer to households, not individuals.

The universe was constructed by obtaining lists from various sources and collating them into one integrated file of I.B.M. cards. Each list was unique and presented special problems in obtaining it,

copying it, correcting it, eliminating duplications, and integrating it with the master file. The general procedure was to read a name from a new list, search for that name in the master card file and insert the new name into the master file if there was no one at the same address with that name. There were many duplicate names because the lists were defined in terms of households; therefore, the address was the key in eliminating duplications in the master file.

Some of the lists were obtained only under conditions of strictest confidentiality. For these lists a special system of checking and integrating households was used: the master list was physically brought to the agency, and all verifications and insertions of new cards done at the agency, sometimes by the survey staff and sometimes by special trained agency staff. The advantage of this method is that the list itself never left the agency, and since the cards integrated into the master list were indistinguishable from thousands of others, the confidential relationship of the agency and its clients was preserved. The objective was to represent all segments of the community in the universe. For example, to sample only from a list of Combined Jewish Appeal contributors would eliminate those households which had not contributed, for whatever reason. A particular concern was that persons who had not contributed due to inadequate income or recent immigration to Canada, not be excluded as a group from selection to the sample.

Table 1 presents the sources of each list, the approximate size of the list and its estimated yield for the universe. For several reasons size and yield could only be estimated. In several instances the list-integration was done by the particular agency for reasons of

Table 1

Sources of Lists of Jewish Households

Source	Estimated Size	Estimated Yield
Combined Jewish Appeal:		
1975 Campaign	20,900	20,000
Prospects	3,300	2,500
Young Men's Hebrew Association	11,200	4,300
Canadian Zionist Federation	9,900	2,800
Allied Jewish Community Services:		
Trades division	4,000	330
Professions division	2,200	350
Women's division 1977	500	90
Recent wedding prospects	170	140
Women's division prospects	140	60
Golden Age Association	4,500	2,500
Jewish Public Library	2,400	900
Communauté Sepharade du Quebec	2,000	1,200
McGill Graduates	400	110
Jewish Family Service	380	290
Jewish Immigrant Aid Service	230	110
Israelis	120	90
Lubavitch	90	60
Snowball sampling procedure	80	50
	65,510	35,880

confidentiality, and thus survey staff had little or no control over the process. Also, the yield depended on the order in which the lists were integrated: obviously, lists integrated into the master file later in the project had lower yields because of duplication with earlier lists. The order of collation of lists was roughly as follows. The Combined Jewish Appeal (CJA) campaign list was used as a base. Then lists were integrated in order of expected yield, so that if the task became too difficult, lengthy and expensive, the procedure could be stopped and yet the resources would have been allocated most effectively. As it turned out, we were able to finish almost 100% of most major lists of Jewish agencies and groups. The notable exceptions are the various synagogue membership lists, which would have overwhelmed our staff, and the list of members of Bnai Brith lodges in Montreal, which was unavailable.

The master file was compiled over a three month period beginning in June of 1978, and was directed by a research assistant. Construction of the list occurred simultaneously with the development of the questionnaire. College students obtained through Hillel, Jewish Vocational Service, and other sources were employed in the arduous process of list verification and integration of households from lists into the master file.

Most of the sources in Table 1 are self-explanatory, but a few deserve special attention. After some delay, the CJA list was provided by the Allied Jewish Community Services (AJCS) on computer-generated self-stick tabs, which were peeled off and placed on the original card file. This list had several hundred businesses which had to be

eliminated. Also, the addresses were incorrect in many cases, and there were many duplicate entries (husband and wife listed separately yet at the same address). This list was updated and improved by using the various CJA and AJCS lists of prospects (Table 1, rows 2, 8 and 9) and various divisions not fully represented on the CJA list (Trades (row 5), professions (row 6), and women's division (row 7).

In some cases portions of lists were selected for their expected high yield. The Canadian Zionist Federation list was in order by postal code district, and it was decided to concentrate on areas with heavy concentrations of Jews, and on large postal codes where a long list of names in alphabetic order within the postal code made the job easier. 1100 names were omitted from this list. Other selections were made in the AJCS lists, and only the current clients of the Jewish Immigrant Aid Service were considered.

Some of the lists are quite specific. The list of Jewish graduates of McGill was provided by a recent graduate. The list of "Israelis" was provided by a person affiliated with the Canadian Zionist Federation. The snowball sample was an attempt to build up the representation of young households. A few people known to the staff were asked to generate names of young Jews who had recently formed households: the resulting persons would be asked to again generate lists, and so on. Although there was substantial effort put into this part of the research, the yield was quite low.

As Table 1 shows, about 36,000 households were generated from about 65,500 households on the various lists. All the figures in Table 1 are rough estimations, but they give an idea of the magnitude of

the task. The list operation required the organized and concerted efforts of one supervisor (half-time), four students (full-time), one typist (half-time), as well as the co-investigators, for three months.

Drawing and Verifying the Sample

With the universe complete the sample was drawn and verified. The first step was to enumerate the list, which turned out to contain 35,739 households. One thousand random numbers between 1 and 35,739 were selected and the cards were drawn out of the master file for verification. Thus, the sampling fraction is .0280, or about 3% of the universe, and the sample is a simple random sample of households.

The list of 1000 for the sample was verified to ensure that the market research firm organizing the interviewing (Centre de Recherche sur L'Opinion Publique) would have a high yield of completed interviews from the list of 1000 households provided. The person on the list was telephoned and asked if the name, address, and telephone number were correct. The justification given was that the Allied Jewish Community Services was verifying their records. If the number was incorrect the Telephone Directory Information was called. Also, Bell Canada was approached directly for corrections and updatings of published telephone numbers. Other resources were Telephone Directory, Lovell's Red Book (names in sequence by telephone number), Lovell's Criss-cross directory (names in sequence by area and street) and Lovell's alphabetic listing of names.

Table 2 presents the results of the verification procedure. Five hundred fifty-one of the 1000 cards drawn had correct names,

Table 2

Analysis of Verification of Original Sample List

Acceptable		
- correct & complete information	551	60%
- incomplete information	310	26.1%
Unacceptable	N	%
- organizations or business	2	0.2%
- deceased	1	0.1%
- hospitalized	1	0.1%
- not Jewish	28	2.8%
- definitely left Montreal - probably left Montreal	25	2.5%
- not traced (but probably in Montreal)	8	0.8%
- no information	74	7.4%
	139	13.9%
TOTAL	1000	100.0%

addresses, and phone numbers. Three hundred ten cards had incorrect names, address, and/or telephone numbers which were corrected during the verification procedure. One hundred thirty nine cards were unacceptable for the reasons given in Table 2. "Not Jewish" means that when the justification for the call was given, the respondent said "But, I'm not Jewish," or the equivalent. "Definitely left Montreal" means the person answering the phone said "They left Montreal" or the equivalent. "Probably left Montreal" means that there is weaker evidence of some kind that the household had left Montreal. Among those not traced, many had unlisted telephone numbers, while others probably had moved away, or changed their marital status in a way which affected their address. Yet some of these not traced were felt to be still in Montreal, based on evidence obtained in the search procedures. A smaller group may have been resident in Montreal with a published telephone number, but simply were not reached during the verification procedure. It is improbable that more than a few of those not traced were deceased or hospitalized.

A second batch of cards was drawn randomly and verified as they were drawn, to provide a total of 1000 households. It was necessary to draw 166 new cards to obtain the necessary 139 verified households. Roughly the same percentage of households were not accepted as in the first draw (27 out of 166 or 16% compared to 139 out of 1000 or 14%).

In the first draw there were no duplicate households, but in the second draw there were two duplicates: one household listed under a different name but at the same address as a household in the first draw, and where verification revealed they were the same household;

and one household with identical name, address, and telephone number as in the first draw. Thus, the best estimate of the proportion of the master file that is duplicate is two out of 1166, or .0016 (0.16%).

The resulting 1000 households were placed in order by area to facilitate assignment to interviewers, and given to the Centre de Recherche sur L'Opinion Publique (C.R.O.P.). The master card file was destroyed after completion of the survey.

The Questionnaire

The completed questionnaire contained 332 questions.

Three areas are examined in the questionnaire. Below are presented specific examples of the issues explored in each section, and of the richness of the data yielded by the survey. It should be remembered that many of these issues were addressed by more than one question.

A) Socio-demographic Background

The following variables describing socio-demographic characteristics were included:

1. age
2. sex
3. education (secular)
4. occupation
5. income
6. mother tongue, languages currently used, knowledge of French or English.
7. place of birth/migration history

8. citizenship
9. parental place of birth and present residence
10. marital status/family household composition
11. background of spouse
12. residence, employment status, and perceived plans of children over 18
13. English/French competence of all children
14. residence in Montreal (location, type, value)
15. time spent outside Montreal during the year
16. emotional stress scale

B. Jewish Background

1. experience of the Holocaust
2. knowledge of Hebrew, Ladino and Yiddish
3. religion of spouse
4. identification as Ashkenazi or Sephardi
5. formal Jewish education
6. experience in Jewish summer camps or youth groups
7. visits to Israel (number, duration)
8. Jewish education of children (past, present, future)
9. children's experience of Jewish summer camps
10. children's knowledge of Hebrew
11. religious denomination, synagogue attendance, and membership
12. Jewish ritual observance (six rituals)
13. use and evaluation of Jewish community agencies and services

14. involvement in the Jewish community (organizational membership, reading of the Jewish press, attending of lectures)
15. pattern of Jewish charitable contributions (amount, recipient, trend, motivations)
16. attitudinal measures of Jewish identity
17. attitudes on issues in Jewish education
18. evaluation of Jewish community leadership

C. Political Attitudes and Migration Propensities

1. probability of respondent's migrating within 5 years (under different scenarios)
2. probability of respondent's children over 18 residing in Montreal in five years
3. reasons for and against emigration
4. actions taken, if any, regarding emigration

attitudes on political, economic and social issues in Quebec

6. perceived anti-Semitism in Quebec

The construction of the questionnaire required several months. Five full drafts of the questionnaire were developed with the final text emerging from the fifth draft. Potential questions were compiled from other Jewish community surveys and from completed surveys of other ethnic groups in Montreal.

Additional advice on the content of the questionnaire was obtained from many other sources. The professional staff and the lay board of the Jewish Community Research Institute read drafts of the questionnaire, as did professionals of the Allied Jewish Community Services and

the Canadian Jewish Congress. As a result, a number of areas were strengthened dealing primarily with community priorities. Other Jewish researchers recommended inclusion of questions to identify holocaust survivors.

The questionnaire was translated into French for French-speaking respondents. As well, a Yiddish lexicon was prepared to assist Yiddish-speaking interviewers to conduct interviews in Yiddish. Only 3 interviews could not be completed because of a language barrier between respondent and interviewer. The questionnaire was pre-tested twice; five pretests of early drafts were administered by a research assistant and ten more were conducted by C.R.O.P. on the final draft. In addition, questions adopted from other surveys had been pre-tested earlier. Notwithstanding the pre-tests and the careful construction, a few errors remained in the final draft. Most of the errors were noticed following printing of the questionnaires; corrections were included in the instructions to the interviewers and as part of their training. A few remaining errors were corrected later at the coding stage, in consultation with C.R.O.P.

FIELDWORK

Recruitment of Interviewers

During the months of July and August 1978, a list of potential interviewers was compiled for eventual submission to C.R.O.P. It was decided that the ideal interviewer would be a "middle aged" Jewish female. Survey research experience has suggested that middle aged females make better interviewers than other sorts of persons. Because of the sensitive nature of our survey and apprehension in the Jewish community, it was decided to use only Jewish interviewers to increase rapport between interviewer and respondent.

Ladies associated with Jewish volunteer groups were approached for names of potentially interested persons. The response was hampered by conflicting staffing needs of the C.J.A. campaign, as well as by the reluctance of volunteer organizations to have their workers paid for the interviewing. An ad in the Canadian Jewish News was used to broaden the base. Approximately 100 names were eventually given to C.R.O.P.

From this list, about 40 interviewers were included in the original interviewing group; of these, about 20 persisted throughout the entire period of the survey—these 20 including the interviewers found to be most effective. Interviewers were paid at the rate of $4.00 per hour, plus related expenses. Some interviewers declined to participate after the initial contacts from C.R.O.P.; others were excused after the initial screening; still others dropped out after their first trial interview. The experienced attrition rate is normal for a lengthy fieldwork period involving non-professional interviewers.

Because of the decision to use "amateurs" as interviewers, it was important to provide as extensive preparation as possible. The interviewers selected by C.R.O.P. were given thorough instruction in interview procedures, designed to prepare them for all usual contingencies (reluctance to respond, etc.). Each interviewer returned to C.R.O.P. after completion of the first interview for a thorough debriefing. The questionnaire was explained in detail to the interviewers, and a kit including written instructions relating to specific questions was given to each. A meeting was held at Cummings House on Sept. 6, 1978, at which time Professor Weinfeld and Messrs. George Kantrowitz and Jack Kantrowitz answered questions from the interviewers.

For the duration of the fieldwork each interviewer was encouraged to contact C.R.O.P.'s fieldwork supervisor to discuss problems as they arose. The interviewers were assigned a list of names, coordinated so that the respondents and the interviewer lived in the same area of Montreal, when possible, to cut down on travel costs.

Review of the Fieldwork

The fieldwork lasted essentially three months—September, October, and November 1978. Originally, it was hoped that the survey might be completed by late September, before the onset of the Jewish High Holidays. Because of the initial problems in securing adequate numbers of interviewers (including the pressure of the concurrent C.J.A.), it proved impossible to achieve that objective. Once into the Holiday period, interviewing was hampered by the Holidays themselves, since it was decided that no interviewing could take place on the Holidays.

(Formally, interviews were discouraged on Shabbat, but individual appointments on Shabbat between respondents and interviewers were permitted.)

An additional factor which drew out the interviewing was the onset of colder weather in November, which increased the attrition of interviewers. Finally, the length of the questionnaire exceeded our earlier estimates, further slowing down our completion rate.

On Aug. 30, 1978 letters were sent from A.J.C.S. and C.J.C. to all the households in the sample, informing them of the impending interview and encouraging them to participate. In the following week, the interviewers took to the field. Initially, interviewers would make unscheduled visits to prospective households, in an effort to complete the interview and avoid possible bias in the pattern of responses. Eventually, telephone contacts were used to save time, and interviewers could then schedule interviews with respondents at convenient times. In each case, the objective was to interview the head of the household. When it became apparent that the head of the household would not be available, it was decided to interview the next most knowledgeable/authoritative adult in the household. A minimum of three attempts per respondent were carried out before designating the respondent as unreachable but individual interviewers often exceeded this limit of three attempts. (Of course, respondents who indicated a <u>firm</u> refusal to participate were not approached again.) Towards the completion of the formal fieldwork period, two of the more competent interviewers were assigned the task of re-checking those names designated as unreachable. The resourcefulness of these interviewers succeeded in

adding almost 20 interviews to the total. Following the survey, 10% of the respondents were called by C.R.O.P., to verify both the fact and the quality of the completed interview.

A final total of 657 completed interviews was obtained as shown in Table 3. Ten of the 1000 respondents were omitted, as they resided outside the Montreal metropolitan area. Sixty-three households were excluded from the sample, for the reasons specified in Table 3. The 23 persons who moved could not be re-traced. Of the 937 eligible households 51 never responded to any interview contacts, though the address appeared to be correct for the given respondent. Two hundred and fifteen refused to respond (either themselves or via another household member); fourteen declared they were too ill.

The final response rate was 70% (657 out of 937) and compares very favorably with similar surveys in the Montreal area, and with survey research in general. Reports from the field shed some light on reasons for non-response, apart from a general (and growing) reluctance by North Americans to participate in lengthy interviews. A secondary reason was fear not only from holocaust survivors, but from other segments of the community, that the results of the survey (ie. their responses) might not be truly confidential or that the "master list" could be used by anti-Semites. A minor reason was resentment of the J.C.R.I., and reluctance to participate in a survey under its sponsorship.

Following the survey, the data were coded by C.R.O.P. in conjunction with the project directors, and punched onto I.B.M. computer cards and verified with nine cards per respondent. The data from the

cards were then transcribed on to the tape, for subsequent analysis.

A clean tape was delivered to the J.C.R.I.

Table 3

Results of the Fieldwork

	N	Contacts percent
Outside Montreal	10	1.0
Moved	23	2.3
Wrong address[1]	3	0.3
Not Jewish	15	1.5
Incapacitated[2]	7	0.7
Other (dead)	2	0.2
Language barrier[3]	3	0.3
Completed contacts	937	93.7
Total sample	1000	100.0

	N	Interviews percent of contacts
Completed interviews	657	70.0
No response[4]	27	2.9
Temporary absence[5]	9	1.0
Prolonged absence	15	1.6
Individual refusal[6]	206	22.0
Household refusal[7]	9	1.0
Sick	14	1.5
Completed contacts	937	100.0

[1] Non-existant, non-residential

[2] Physical or mental incapacity

[3] Arabic, Russian

[4] No answer at presumed correct address

[5] Vacation, business trip, etc.

[6] Respondent refuses to be interviewed

[7] Member of respondent's household refuses

RESULTS

The results of the survey are presented in several sections. The first two will review the general profile and Jewish profile of the sample. The third section will present the attitudes of the sample on contemporary issues. The final section will analyze the likelihood of emigration and its possible impact on the Jewish community. The results presented here are not exhaustive, and may omit some variables on which data exist. The aim is to present an overview of the findings, indicate the range of data collected, and perhaps point the way to more intensive research and analysis on the specific issues presented below.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Age

The age distribution of our sample seen in Table 4 demonstrates the aging nature of the Montreal Jewish population: about 31.4% of our respondents are 65 years and over. Jews have the oldest age structure of any identifiable group in North America. This is due to historically low comparative fertility, and longevity associated with higher than average socio-economic background.

Table 4

Age

Age Category	Relative Frequency (Percent)
20 to 24 Years	0.9
25 to 29 Years	5.5
30 to 34 Years	8.1
35 to 39 Years	8.5
40 to 44 Years	7.2
45 to 49 Years	7.5
50 to 54 Years	9.4
55 to 59 Years	11.7
60 to 64 Years	9.9
65 to 69 Years	10.2
70 to 74 Years	8.7
75 to 79 Years	7.2
80 to 84 Years	3.2
85 to 89 Years	1.5
90 to 94 Years	0.3
95 Plus	0.3
TOTAL	100.0
	(657)

Sex

The large number of female respondents seen in Table 5, reflects widows and divorced females heading households, as well as females responding for absent male household heads. In our sample, 43% of the female respondents are either widowed or divorced, compared to 5% of the male respondents. Female respondents are also more aged (because of the large proportion of widows) than male respondents. While 28% of the male respondents are over 65, 39% of the female respondents are in this age category. The distribution of age by sex is seen in Table 6.

Table 5

Sex

Sex	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Male	72.3
Female	27.4
Missing	0.3
	100.0
	(657)

Table 6

Respondent's Sex by Age

	Sex		
Age	Male	Female	Total
0-40	121	44	165 (25.2)
41-64	221	65	286 (43.7)
65 plus	133	71	204 (31.1)
Total	475 (72.5)	180 (27.5)	655 (100.0)

Place of Birth

As seen in Table 7, 40.6% of the respondents were born in Montreal, with another 7.1% born in North America outside Montreal. Thus 52.4% were born outside North America. Roughly 10% were born in Asia/Africa; the rest were born in Europe. This large proportion of foreign born household heads is similar to the situation in Toronto, 1970, where 49.4% were born outside North America (Richmond, 1972). Montreal has had a larger North-African migration, compared to Toronto. It is this large proportion of foreign born Jews which makes the Montreal Jewish community so different from communities in American cities. Only one sixth of our respondents have at least one parent born in North America.

Marital Status

In the sample as a whole, more than three fourths of the respondents are presently married as seen in Table 8. Marital status varies by both sex and age of the respondents. We find 88% of the male respondents presently married, compared to 48% of the female respondents, with the latter including many divorced and widowed female household heads. With regard to age, we find 87% of respondents aged 41 to 64 presently married, compared with 62% of those over 65 and 79% of those under 40. It should be remembered that these percentages are compiled for a sample of household heads, and not of the total adult Jewish population.

If we eliminate from each age category those respondents who have never married - and thus are at no risk for divorce, we find a slight increase in the percentage divorced or separated in the younger age

Table 7

Place of Birth

Place of Birth	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Montreal	40.6
Quebec Province	1.4
Ontario	1.2
Other Province	1.2
United States	3.2
Israel	1.1
North Africa	7.6
East Europe	29.4
West Europe	6.4
Other Europe	0.6
Other Middle East	1.2
USSR	5.5
Other Country	0.6
TOTAL	100.0 (657)

Table 8

Respondent's Marital Status

Status	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Presently Married	76.4
Never Married	6.4
Separated	0.6
Divorced	4.0
Widowed	11.4
Not applicable, no answer	1.2
TOTAL	100.0 (657)

group, compared to the older. For respondents under 40, the rate is 6.4%, for those 41-64 the rate is 4.7%, for those 65 and over the rate is 4.3%.

Education

The sample's educational profile (Table 9, 10) is greater than that of the Montreal population as a whole, when compared with 1971 census data for Montreal. The distribution is almost identical to that obtained from a sample of Jewish household heads in Toronto, 1970 (Richmond, 1972).

Well over one third of our respondents indicate they have had some form of post-secondary education, as measured either in years of schooling or in highest degree or diploma received. Approximately 43% of our sample have had some post-secondary education; for Canadians aged 14 and over in 1972, the comparable figure was 18%.

Table 9
Education

Years of Education		Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
0 to 4 Years		5.9	6.1
5 to 7 Years		10.5	10.8
8 to 10 Years		15.4	15.8
11 to 14 Years		34.4	35.3
15 Plus		31.2	32.0
Missing Data		2.6	Missing
	TOTAL	100.0	100.0
		(657)	

Table 10

Highest Diploma-Degree Received

Diploma	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
None	12.6	12.8
Elementary, Primary	15.7	15.9
Secondary	25.6	26.0
Post High School	7.0	7.1
Bachelor	12.0	12.2
Master	5.0	5.1
Doctorate	1.8	1.9
Professional Degree	10.8	11.0
Technical Degree	5.3	5.4
Other	2.3	2.3
Don't know	0.8	Missing
Not applicable	0.9	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Socio-economic Status

As in the case of education, we find the occupational distribution of our sample, to be higher than that of the non-Jewish population. For example, the 1971 census found that for males over 14 in the labour force, 5.5% held managerial or administrative occupations, and 7.5% were in the professional or technical categories. These are well below the percentages in Table 11, even considering that the Montreal sample is an older group.

Table 11

Occupation by Census Category

Occupation	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Managers, Administrators	37.1	43.0
Professional, Technical	10.7	12.3
Clerical	11.4	13.2
Sales	9.9	11.4
Service	1.5	1.8
Skilled Labour	6.8	7.9
Other	8.9	10.2
Missing Data*	13.5	Missing
TOTAL	100.0	100.0

* Missing data include these with no answer, or with no occupation, such as those defining themselves as housewives. Unemployed respondents list their usual occupation, and retired persons list their last occupation.

Looking at the distribution for both occupation and education, we can conclude that on average our sample scores higher than the population distributions. Yet this high average includes within it a wide range. Six percent of our respondents indicate they are unemployed. In addition, the variance in family income from all sources is substantial. While 13% of those responding indicate family incomes (from all sources) of $50,000 per year or more, 11.5% report incomes of less than $5,000 and an additional 14.5% reported incomes of between $5,000 and $10,000. Interviewers described the furnishings in 9% of the dwellings visited as "poor." Thus a significant minority of the

sample, concentrated among respondents aged 65 and over, can be defined as living in poverty.

Looking at the aged (65 and over), we find 33% of the group with total incomes less than $5,000, and an additional 28% with incomes between $5,000 and $10,000. While it is true that incomes of the aged must support households of small size—usually one or two persons—the possibility of absolute and relative poverty certainly exists for these respondents. In the younger age categories, we find 9% of respondents under 40, and 13% of those 41-64, with total family incomes under $10,000.

Female respondents were more likely than males to report low incomes. While 19% of the males (of all ages) reported total incomes of less than $10,000, 46% of the females did so.

Language

As in the case of place of birth, we note in Table 12 the large numbers who claim a language other than English or French as their mother tongue (51.4%). About 31% claim Yiddish/Jewish/Hebrew. Over half (52%) of the respondents claim to speak French very or fairly well (Table 13). This exceeds the figure of 44% of all Montreal Jews who claim to speak French, from the 1971 census. There may be imprecision associated with self-reporting of a given linguistic ability. For example, about 30% claim to use French exclusively, primarily, or as often as English at work. It should be noted that respondents indicate that their children possess greater French-speaking ability than they do. Roughly 64% of the children of our respondents are thought by their parents to speak French either very or fairly well.

Table 12

Mother Tongue

Language	Relative Frequency (Percent)
English	46.4
French	5.0
Yiddish-Jewish-Hebrew	31.2
Russian	1.2
Other East European	7.0
German	2.3
Other European	1.7
Arabic	2.6
Ladino	0.5
Other	1.8
Don't know	0.2
Not applicable	0.2
TOTAL	100.0 (657)

What is evident is that English predominates as the language of use in our sample, regardless of asserted knowledge of French. Slightly over 7% of our sample use French most often when speaking to either their spouse or children. Whereas 46% of our respondents claim English as their mother tongue, almost 75% indicate they speak English "very well", an equivalent percentage speak mainly English with their spouse, and 83% speak mainly English with their children. Thus the historic pattern among Jewish immigrants has been one of assimilation into English.

Table 13

Ability to Speak French

Level of Ability (self-reported)	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Very Well	24.4
Fairly Well	27.7
With Some Difficulty	19.3
With Great Difficulty	12.5
Not at All	15.8
Not Applicable	0.3
TOTAL	100.0 (657)

Pattern of Residence in Montreal

Respondents were asked to indicate their area of current residence in Montreal, and that five years earlier. As seen in Table 14, there was a little movement within the city in the space of five years. Of course, individuals may have moved extensively, but the net result of these moves produced an aggregate pattern not significantly different from that five years earlier. The "centre" of Jewish Montreal is the Snowdon - Cote des Neiges area, surrounded primarily by concentrations of Jews in Hampstead and Cote St. Luc to the West; Town of Mount Royal, St. Laurent, and Chomedy - Laval to the North; and NDG, Westmount, and the downtown area to the South.

Table 14

Area of Residence in Montreal

Area of Montreal	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)	
		Now	Five Years Ago
Cote St. Luc	120	18.3	16.5
Outremont	14	2.1	2.9
Park Ave., Park Extension	5	0.8	1.7
Snowdon, Cote des Neiges	217	33.0	31.2
Hampstead	46	7.0	5.4
Town of Mount Royal	29	4.4	4.3
St. Laurent	59	9.0	9.7
Westmount	32	4.9	3.8
Chomedey/Laval	41	6.2	6.8
N.D.G.	36	5.5	6.2
Downtown Area	13	2.0	2.3
West Island	31	4.7	2.9
Other	11	1.7	2.2
Not Applicable/no answer	3	0.5	4.1*
TOTAL	657	100.0	100.0

* includes recent immigrants to Montreal.

An interesting pattern emerges in a detailed breakdown of residential pattern by age. The aged (65 ±) are the group most concentrated in Snowdon/Cote des Neiges, with 54% residing in this area. Young respondents (35 or less) are the second most likely group to reside in this area (31%). Only 3% of this group reside "in the downtown area." The middle age groups, while certainly also present in Snowdon/Cote des Neiges, are more likely to reside in outlying areas such as

Hampstead/Cote St. Luc, or Chomedy/Laval. This suggests that while the community may be radiating, over time, outward from its core of Snowdon/Cote des Neiges, young and/or new households may also prefer to begin residential careers in the Jewish core, moving to suburban areas with the passage of time. The data at hand cannot be used to predict firmly the future geographic distribution of Montreal's Jewish community.

JEWISH BACKGROUND

Ethnic Origin and Religious Denomination

In our sample, 11% of those identifying their background, identify themselves as of Sephardi origin, and 89% as Ashkenazi. Sephardi respondents are significantly younger than the Ashkenazi respondents, with only 10% aged 65 or over, compared to the sample average of more than 30%. As might be expected, Sephardi respondents are predominantly foreign born with 71% claiming birth in North Africa, 12% in other Arab countries in the Middle East, 8% in Europe, 1.5% in Israel, and 7% in Canada - specifically Montreal. On the question of secular education, measured in years of schooling, we find no significant difference between the Sephardi levels and those described in Table 9. Sephardi respondents are also slightly more frequent synagogue attenders than are Ashkenazi respondents; 28% claim to attend at least every Sabbath (if not daily) compared to 16% of the Ashkenazim.

The denominational profile of the sample confirms the relative strength of Orthodoxy and the weakness of Reform Judaism in Montreal. As is apparent from Tables 15 and 16, many non-Orthodox must be attenders at Orthodox services since there are fewer respondents whose identification is Orthodox than actually attend Orthodox services. Twenty per cent of the sample never attend services and an additional 33% attend only on the High Holidays. This high rate of non-attendance and infrequent attendance, as well as the commanding role of Orthodoxy, is roughly similar to the situation found in Toronto in 1970 (Richmond, 1972), and conforms to the pattern found in all North American Jewish

communities - with regard to uniformly low rates of synagogue attendance (Sklare, 1974).

Table 15

Religious Identification

Denomination	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Orthodox	39.7	41.0
Conservative	33.5	34.5
Reform	9.0	9.3
Reconstructionist	1.4	1.4
None	9.7	10.0
Other	3.7	3.8
Don't know	2.7	Missing
Not applicable	0.3	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Table 16

Denomination of Synagogue Attended

Denomination	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Orthodox	50.8	65.2
Conservative	18.9	24.2
Reform	5.8	7.4
Reconstructionist	1.4	1.8
Other	1.1	1.4
Don't know	1.4	Missing
Not applicable*	20.7*	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

* includes those who never attend services.

What role does religion play in the life of Montreal Jewry? Despite the sporadic attendance at synagogue, fully 84% of our sample identify themselves with one of the four official denominations of Judaism: Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Reconstructionist.

Of those who attend services, moreover, roughly 68% are members of congregations. (This represents nearly 50% of the sample). The proportion of synagogue members is somewhat higher than what we might expect from the low attendance rates. For example, we might define a "regular" synagogue attender as someone attending on the major holidays and some Sabbaths, or more often. A total of 228 respondents fall into this category, yet 326 claim membership in a synagogue. These findings denote low attendance, even among the congregational membership. Many Montreal Jews, like Jews in other North American cities, belong to synagogues for reasons such as obligation, tradition, other services (eg. youth services or education). The religious behavior of our sample is, in summary, inconsistent. Infrequent attendance at services co-exists with a relatively high Orthodox identification and a high observance of religious ritual.

Approximately 46% of the respondents claim to keep kosher at home; this high response is consistent with the attendance rate at Orthodox services, over 50% in our sample. This proportion, however, is greater than the proportion of regular synagogue attenders. In other words, observance of Kashrut may assume more than a religious significance. In our sample, 93% attend a Seder; 80% refrain from eating bread on Passover; 81% past on Yom Kipper and light Chanukah Candles; 61% light Sabbath candles.

It is interesting to note that with the exception of the aged respondents, detailed age breakdowns reveal little difference - or reduction - in the frequency of synagogue attendance for younger respondents. For example, respondents under 35 are slightly less likely to be total non-attenders and slightly more likely to be frequent attenders than are respondents aged 36-50. We cannot determine whether this is due to a revival of religiosity among the young or sampling bias. If synagogue attendance is low, observance of Jewish ritual is high.

Jewish Education of Respondents

In comparison to any American community (see Bock, 1976; Himmelfarb, 1977), we find higher rates of Jewish education for our respondents. Eighty per cent have had some formal Jewish education. As seen in Table 17, the majority of those with any formal Jewish education, had some experience of either dayschool, yeshiva or cheder education (45.4/80.1=57%). The median number of years received for each type of education is 5 for Yeshiva, 7 for day school, 5 for cheder, 5 for afternoon school, 5 for Sunday school, and 3 for private tutor. Many respondents received more than one type.

Jewish Education of Children of Respondents

Our sample is one in which a high priority is accorded to the Jewish education of its children. Looking at all respondents' children, including those whose children have finished their education, we see in Table 18 that the proportion of those children with no Jewish education

Table 17

Respondents' Jewish Education

Type of Jewish Education	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
None	19.0	19.9
Private Tutor	9.6	10.0
Sunday School	2.7	2.9
Afternoon School	21.9	22.9
Day School	14.6	15.3
Yeshiva or Cheder*	27.9	29.1
No answer/don't know	4.3	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

*Respondents' score based on "highest" level attained (e.g. a person with some "afternoon school" and some "day school" is listed under day school).

(20%) is similar to that of the respondent's generation; however, there seems to be a change in the proportions of children receiving day school or Yeshiva education, compared to any other type, when compared with the education of their parents. The "Cheder" option seems to have been replaced by that of the day school. The finding of no generational decline in the proportions receiving any formal Jewish education differs from the prevailing pattern in the United States.

Of those respondents (N=185) with either children currently receiving or expecting to have children who will receive any Jewish education, 126 or 68% are providing or will provide day school or Yeshiva education.

This proportion is well above that found in Table 18, which includes children of all ages, where the corresponding proportion - day school or Yeshiva students out of those children with any education - is 39.6 + 3.2 divided by 80.3, or 53%.

Table 18

Education of Respondents' Jewish Children

Type of Jewish Education	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
None	219	19.7
Private Tutor	87	7.8
Sunday School	36	3.2
Afternoon School	293	26.4
Day School	440	39.6
Yeshiva	35	3.2
TOTAL	1,110*	100.0

*for 1,110 children aged 4 and above.

This demonstrates a shift to more extensive Jewish education for younger respondents, with younger children, and compares very well with Toronto, where a 1973-74 study found that 43% of Toronto's Jewish children who were receiving any Jewish education, were in day schools. The finding of a shift in favor of the day school option by those parents currently providing Jewish education to their children has been noted in the United States as well (Bock, 1976), though not to the same extent.

Impact of the Holocaust

The sample of 657 respondents produced 135 defined as survivors of the holocaust - persons who were in Europe during World War II (excluding service in the Allied Armies). As well, the sample yielded 167 persons who are defined as children of survivors - persons with at least one parent defined as a survivor. Many of the latter are themselves survivors, and include persons who lost their parents during World War II. Only 24% (N=39) of these children of survivors are under 40. Children of survivors would be found primarily among the children of our respondents, and not among the respondents themselves. The high proportion of survivors among the adult population of Montreal, reflects the general feature of the high immigrant proportion, and differs markedly from the case for American Jewish communities.

Charitable Contributions

Roughly 87% of the sample claim to have contributed to the Combined Jewish Appeal in the past year. In compiling the master list of households, it was estimated that roughly 23,500 of the 35,880 households were obtained from CJA sources. Allowing for the ineligible households (business, non-Jews, non-Montrealers, etc.) it seems that about 65-70% of our final list came from CJA-related sources. It would seem,therefore,that some respondents may have claimed a CJA donation untruthfully, comparing the percentages of 87% with 65-70%. Another possibility is that several households (e.g. parents, grandparents, brothers, older children, etc.) may make one gift (e.g.

from a business) to represent several potential household sources. This may well be true for female respondents in our sample, in particular.

The pattern of giving to the CJA clearly reveals the predominance of the small giver. The median contribution per household in our sample falls in the $50-99 range, as seen in Table 19. The median family income as indicated by our respondents is about $20,000. Respondents were asked if they made any other donations in the past year to local Jewish causes, apart from the C.J.A. or synagogue membership. About 80% responded positively, and again the median donation falls in the $50-99 range.

Over 70% of the respondents thought that one half or less of the total collected for CJA went to Israel. Respondents were then informed that 60% is sent to Israel, and were asked to express their attitude to this percentage distribution. Of those responding, 44% feel that the proportions should remain the same, 29% feel more should go to local needs; 27% feel that more should go to Israel. This suggests that while a majority of our respondents may be dissatisfied by the existing CJA allocation between Israel and local needs, no clear alternative can be adduced from the preferences of our respondents.

To what extent are contributions to the CJA determined by income? How does the rate of giving vary for each income category? Table 20 presents this information, for all those respondents for whom we have information on both total family income and total contribution (from respondent and spouse) to the CJA. It should be stressed that we have no check on the accuracy of either the income or the contribution reported.

Table 19

Amount Contributed by Respondents to Combined Jewish Appeal

Amount in Dollars	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
$ 0 - 49	29.8	36.4
50 - 99	13.7	16.7
100 - 499	20.9	25.5
500 - 999	6.5	8.0
1000 - 4999	7.3	8.9
5000 - 9999	2.4	3.0
10000 - Plus	1.2	1.5
Don't know	4.1	Missing
Not Applicable	14.0	Missing*
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

*includes those who did not contribute.

Table 20

Contributions to Combined Jewish Appeal, by Income

1 Total family Income range	2 Median Contribution range, in dollars	3 Mean Contribution in dollars	4 Rates of contribution[1]		5 N
Less than			2/1	3/1	
$5,000	0- 49	45	1.0%	1.8%	40
$5,000-9,999	0- 49	62	0.33%	0.8%	65
$10,000-14,999	0- 49	122	0.2%	1.0%	59
$15,000-19,999	0- 49	100	0.1%	0.6%	45
$20,000-24,999	50- 99	424	0.33%	1.9%	41
$25,000-29,999	100-499	490	0.9%	1.8%	39
$30,000-39,999	100-499	590	0.7%	1.7%	57
$40,000-49,999	100-499	892	0.6%	2.0%	41
$50,000-74,999	500-999	1937	1.2%	3.1%	39
$75,000 plus	1,000-4,999	4686	1.7%	3.1%	27
					453

[1] The mid-points of income and contribution ranges are used to calculate the rates. For highest income range, estimated mid-point is $150,000.

We see that the median and mean reported contributions increase as we move to higher income categories. The mean contributions are consistently greater than the median contributions, which suggests a

role of a few relatively large givers within each income category, in raising the mean above the median. In general, the rate of contribution increases with total family income, measured by both median and mean reported contribution, with only some discontinuities. For example, those with reported family incomes between $50,000 and $74,999 contribute an average of $1,937, for 3.1% (using $62,500 to estimate family income); these reporting total family income between $20,000 and $24,999 contribute an average of $424, for 1.9% (using $22,500 to estimate average family income).

- As income increases however it seems that the rate of contribution does not increase by an equivalent amount, as might be suggested by strong principles of progressive "taxation". In the example cited above, where income increases roughly 300%, the rate of contribution increases by 63%.

Jewish Identification

The survey questionnaire includes many items designed to measure facets of the Jewish identity of the respondents. For example, while 51.0% strongly disagree with the acceptability of intermarriage, over 30% agree somewhat or strongly. Age, religion and education may play a role in these differences. Again, 58% indicate that being Jewish affects their residential choices, while 38% claim it does not. Table 21 and 22 gives examples of the type of attitude questions asked, and the distribution of responses.

Table 21

Respondents' Jewish Identification

It is all Right for Jews to Marry Non-Jews

	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Strongly Disagree	51.0	51.4
Disagree Somewhat	16.0	16.1
Don't know	2.3	2.3
Agree Somewhat	20.5	20.7
Strongly Agree	9.4	9.5
Not Applicable	0.8	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Table 22

Being Jewish Affects my Choice of a Place to Live

	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Strongly Disagree	25.1	25.3
Disagree Somewhat	13.5	13.6
Don't know	2.9	2.9
Agree Somewhat	22.8	23.0
Strongly Agree	35.0	35.2
Not Applicable	0.6	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Not surprisingly, other attitude questions, such as those on the importance of the existence of a Jewish people, or the need for Jews in Canada to do all they can to help Israel survive, produce much less variance and uniformly high levels of Jewish identification - of the order of 90% or more.

Apart from attitude questions, the survey provides many indicators of the degree of Jewish background, concern and commitment found in the sample. We find 13% claiming to speak, and 45% claiming to read, Hebrew "very" or "fairly" well. In addition, 59% claim to speak, and 37% claim to read, Yiddish "very" or "fairly" well. This level of facility with both Jewish languages (even allowing for imprecision in self-reported linguistic ability) is significantly higher than that found in the United States (Fishman, 1966; Sklare, 1974). Almost 80% identify themselves as regular or occasional readers of the Jewish Press in Canada. About 48% claim membership in at least one Jewish voluntary organization; 54% claim to have attended at least one lecture, discussion, or an artistic performance spousored by the Jewish community in the past year. These data together suggest a high degree of participation in Jewish cultural life.

The state of Israel is found to play a significant role in the lives of our respondents. Sixty per cent of our sample indicate that they have visited Israel; of this group, 45% have visited more than once, and 14% have spent one year or more there on their longest stay. Twenty-two per cent of the sample indicate they have at some time "seriously considered" moving to Israel.

The strong concern for Israel is reflected in the responses to the types of news (radio, T.V. or newspapers) our respondents find most interesting. Forty-seven per cent find "News on the Middle East" most interesting, compared with 26% indicating "Quebec news" and 20% "national (Canada) news."

While the evidence demonstrating the strong ties to Israel is clear, our respondents do not believe that they must move to Israel "to be a good Jew." Approximately 90% disagreed strongly or somewhat with this statement. Thus our respondents seem committed to both a strong Israel and a viable Jewish life in the diaspora.

Decisions Facing the Leadership of the Jewish Community

Respondents were asked whether they believed that the "leadership of the Jewish community" represents the interests of a "few Jews", "most Jews", or "all Jews." Of those who responded to the question (about 12% in all indicated a "No Answer" or "Don't Know" response), 16% or about one sixth indicate a "few Jews," about 50% respond "most Jews," and 34% respond "all Jews." This question was an attempt to gauge the community's perception of the democratic and representative character of the decision-makers. Reports from the field indicate that some respondents may have misunderstood the term "leadership" to mean the rabbinate, and not the key lay and professional personnel of AJCS, the CJC, and other community organizations. Notwithstanding this difficulty, one can suggest that at least a majority of our sample is reasonably satisfied with the representative character of the leadership.

Public Positions of the Jewish Community on the Referendum and the Next Provincial Election

Approximately 69% of the respondents support the idea of the Jewish community taking a public position on the referendum, with about 22% opposed and 8% undecided. This rather decisive margin was reduced on the question of the Jewish community taking a public position on the next provincial election: about 60% indicate yes, 32% are opposed, and almost 9% are undecided.

With regard to the position on the referendum, approximately one third of the respondents (35%) urge support for "federalism," while close to two thirds (64%) urge support for "revised federalism." Two per cent of those advocating a public position urge support of either sovereignty-association or outright independence. Of those advocating a public position in the next provincial election, 98% urge support for the Liberal candidates; the rest are divided among the Union Nationale, the Parti Québécois, and the Créditistes.

The attitude with regard to the referendum must be seen in light of the response pattern indicated later in this report, in which the proportions of respondents likely to emigrate within five years increases dramatically, should the referendum indicate clear support for independence. This suggests that the upcoming referendum may be a water-shed event in the minds of the respondents, and one in which the outcome is serious enough to warrant public Jewish community involvement. The risk of antagonizing the government of the Parti Québécois—assuming the referendum succeeds and/or the PQ is re-elected—through such public opposition in the referendum debate is perhaps

seen as secondary to the risk of the success of the referendum, with the accompanying confusion and increased emigration possibilities for our respondents.

Community Priorities

Respondents were asked to indicate which of 13 services they felt it was most important for the Jewish community to support. They ranked their top three choices according to their perceived importance. The results are summarized in the Table 23. Column one lists the proportion of first-place votes (most important service) received by each service. Column two reflects the proportion of total votes cast received by each service - weighting first, second, and third place with 3, 2, and 1, point each. Column three weights each vote equally The large response favors medical services as the leading priority.

Recent analyses of organized Jewish life in North America (Elazar, 1976), and local leadership surveys, have advocated or described a decreasing salience of Jewishly funded medical services, compared with other communal priorities. The conventional view is that medical services are to fall increasingly under governmental jurisdiction. Thus the strong vote for medical services may require additional comment. Our survey did not examine why respondents selected specific services. With regard to medical services, some respondents may have been declaring a general sense of the importance of health, and thus medical services, and not that the Jewish community should be financially responsible for them. Many respondents using the Jewish General Hospital may believe that the community actually funds the

hospital "in toto", and withdrawal of funds could jeopardize the survival of the J.G.H. We can estimate the plausibility of such explanations with additional breakdowns of the priorities.

Column four of the table describes the priorities - for most important service - for CJA contributors of $500 and up, and is consistent with the rankings of the total sample. Specifically, the leading position of medical services is retained. If we assume that such givers might have an above average knowledge of the relationship of the Jewish contribution to governmental contribution in the medical area, then any pattern of preference for medical services would not be based on extensive misinformation, but on informed preference. Over one third of this group ranks medical services as the top priority.

Finally, the first priorities of the community do reveal some differences by age. As seen in columns five and six, the elderly respondents are the strongest proponents of medical services (48.7%) compared to those respondents under 40 (36.4%). Still, we find over one third of younger respondents highly supportive of medical services. The magnitude of difference between the responses for medical services and other priorities cannot <u>all</u> be explained by poor comprehension, or misinformation. The community may simply believe in the importance of maintaining Jewish institutions concerned with medical care.

The two priorities ranked behind medical services are services for senior citizens and Jewish education. As could be expected elderly respondents stressed services for senior citizens and the younger respondents emphasized Jewish education, and day care. The fourth ranked priority for the community was that of income support for the Jewish poor.

Table 23

Services	Rankings of Community Service Priorities: First preference	Weighted total**	All "votes"*	First preference for: Contributors of $500.+	Age: < 40	Age: 65+
Day Care	5.6	5.7	5.9	4.4	6.7	3.0
Medical Services	39.9	26.2	20.9	34.5	36.4	48.7
Personal/Family Counselling	2.9	4.6	5.6	3.5	4.2	1.5
Employment Counselling	0.6	2.1	2.7	0.0	0.6	0.0
Athletics & Recreation	0.9	1.3	1.7	1.8	1.8	0.0
Cultural & Adult Educ.	1.1	2.7	3.9	0.0	1.2	0.5
Senior Citizens Services	14.7	17.0	17.7	14.2	9.7	15.7
Jewish Education	15.5	16.3	13.7	20.4	22.4	12.2
Jewish Youth Services	3.9	5.1	5.9	4.4	1.8	5.1
Aid to Immigrants	2.6	4.2	5.0	0.0	2.4	2.0
Inter-Community Relations	0.9	1.5	1.9	2.7	2.4	0.5
Support Jewish Poor	9.8	11.2	12.3	10.6	8.5	9.6
French Language Courses	1.5	2.1	2.8	3.5	1.8	1.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*The percent of all votes cost obtained by each type of service. Thus, day dare received 5.9% of all of the first, second, and third place votes (preferences).

**First place votes given 3 points, 2nd place 2 points, and third place votes given one point.

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES AND ATTITUDES

The Day School Issue

Approximately 61% of the sample were familiar with the "day school funding" issues facing the community, about 29% were not, and 10% were uninterested. These latter 10% were omitted from the following analysis. Respondents were asked "The provincial government ties public funds to schools to the amount of French used in teaching. What do you think the Jewish schools should do?" Three options were provided, to illustrate the range of community opinion rather than three concrete proposals. Five percent of those with a preference (4% of those asked) prefer to reject French language increases and lose all provincial funding. The remaining respondents are evenly divided between those prefering to meet all provincial guidelines (and keep all funding) and those preferring a compromise position increasing French "some" and retaining part of the provincial funding. About 46-48% of those with a point of view support each of these two options.

As seen in Table 24, community sentiment on how to integrate extra French in the day school curriculum is clear: hours of Jewish instruction should not be cut. Most would prefer more French in general studies, using French in some Jewish studies, or lengthening the school day. An intermediate preference is that of cutting hours of English language instruction.

We can examine those respondents (N=126) with either children in the day schools or intention to send children in the future. Of this

Table 24

Preferences on How to Increase Hours of French in Day School Curriculum

Option	First Choice (PCT) Adjusted Freq. All respondents*	First Choice (PCT) Adjusted Freq. Day School	Second Choice (PCT) Adjusted Freq. All respondents*	Second Choice (PCT) Adjusted Freq. Day School
Lengthen the School Day	18.7	13.2	16.2	16.3
More French in General Studies	54.0	59.4	27.7	28.8
Some French used in Jewish Studies	14.1	10.4	29.1	31.7
Cut Hours of Jewish Studies	3.9	7.5	7.4	9.6
Cut Hours of English	9.3	9.4	19.6	13.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*These exclude 1^6 respondents who scored don't know, no answer, or not applicable.

group, 8% prefer to reject increases in French and thus to lose all provincial funds; 59% prefer some increase of French to keep some provincial funding; 33% prefer to increase French the amount necessary to keep all provincial funding. Thus the day school group is less eager than all others, to accept the maximum increases of French, by a margin of 33% to 51% for the rest of the respondents. As seen in Table 24, there are negligible differences in the preferences on how to integrate French, between the full sample and the day school subsample.

The commitment to day school education is exceptionally strong. Of the day school group, only one third can foresee <u>any</u> circumstance (among the six hypothetical ones listed in Table 25) which would lead

them away from the day school option. This means that two thirds of this group would continue their children's enrollment in the day school, regardless of which of the six scenarios was to unfold.

Table 25

Reasons for non-enrollment in the Day Schools (among the one-third with any reason for non-enrollment).

Reason/Circumstance	Per Cent would not enroll their children
1. School day lengthened by one hour	22.9
2. Use French to teach 3 hrs. more general studies	8.8
3. Use French to teach 3 hrs. more Jewish studies	16.4
4. Cut 3 hrs. Jewish studies	47.7
5. Cut back 3 hrs. English instruction	50.0
6. Increase tuition one half	40.9

The response here fits the pattern seen in the previous question, on how to integrate extra French into the curriculum. Respondents fear mostly a decrease in the Jewish educational component and in English language instruction. Forty percent (of this one third) or about 12% of all respondents of the "day-school population" might be lost with an increase of tuition of one half. Of course this might not develop if greater financial aid programs were instituted. The least costly approach, in terms of losing enrollment, is the use of French to teach more general studies.

Satisfaction with Life in Quebec

The large majority of the respondents feel that things are not going well in the province of Quebec with one sixth believing things are going "very" or "rather well." The pattern observed in Table 26 is similar to that found for other questions regarding attitudes toward the Quebec economy and the provincial government. Twelve per cent rate the Quebec economy as good or rather good; nine per cent are very or rather satisfied with the provincial government; eleven per cent were either strongly in favour or in favour of Bill 101.

Table 26

Generally speaking, would you say that in Quebec society at present, things are going very well, rather well, not well, or poorly.

Option	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Very Well	1.2	1.3
Rather well	14.9	15.8
Not well	40.5	43.0
Poorly	37.6	39.9
Not Applicable	5.8	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Integration of the Jewish Community into Quebec Society

The survey shed light on the degree to which the Jewish community is integrated, socially and economically, with the non-Jewish sector of Quebec society. The findings describe a situation of high communal

segregation of the Jewish community from both the English and French communities in Quebec.

Economic segregation is revealed in several questions. Almost one-quarter of those responding indicate that the ethnic background of the majority of their customers or clients are Jewish - in a city where Jews make up less than one-twenty-fifth of the population. Moreover, 70% indicate that the ethnic background of the majority of the executive management of their company or institution, are Jewish (this includes self-employed Jews). In other words, the majority of our sample work for Jews or Jewish-owned enterprises; as indicated earlier, a minority use French to any significant extent at work. Approximately one sixth of those responding indicate that their employer has a francization program, in which they took part.

Jewish economic segregation, like that experienced by any minority group, results from a combination of imposed conditions and voluntary preferences. It is difficult to distinguish between the two. It may be assumed that some Jews may have enjoyed economic interactions with fellow Jews, as well as finding these at least adequately profitable or remunerative. Our respondents indicate that among their business associates (a combination of employers, employees, customers, suppliers, etc.), 35% claim all or most were Jewish, 39% claim some were Jewish, with 27% claiming few or none were Jewish. When asked their specific preference, however, 30% indicate that they agree (strongly or somewhat) that they prefer "doing business with an establishment that I know is owned by Jews," while 66% disagree.

Similar to the economic segregation is the degree of social segregation of the Jewish community. Eighty-seven percent of the sample indicate that all or most of their friends are Jewish, and 53% indicate that among people in their neighborhood, all or most are Jewish. These figures are comparable to the situation found in Toronto in 1970 (Richmond, 1972). In the case of our Montreal sample, mowever, we have a form of double segregation from the English and French communities respectively.

While social segregation is comparably high for all sub-groups of Jews, those who indicate they speak French "very well" demonstrate more economic integration with French Quebecers, and less economic segregation within the Jewish community. Of this group, 38% indicate French Canadians form the majority of customers, compared to 22% of the total sample. Fourteen percent of these French-speakers work for French owned or run enterprises, compared to 7% for all respondents. French-speakers are less likely (24%) to indicate that "most" or "all" of their business associates are Jewish, compared to the sample average of 35%.

Perceptions of Anti-Semitism

Respondents' perceptions about anti-Semitism reveal an interesting pattern. From Table 27, we see that 14% feel there is no anti-Semitism in Quebec, 11% feel there is a "great deal" of anti-Semitism, 43% report "some", while 25% report a "bit". Comparing anti-Semitism in Quebec with the rest of Canada, we find 57% indicating an equivalent amount, 28% perceiving more in Quebec, 16% more in the rest of Canada,

as described in Table 28. Finally, while over half the respondents report no change in anti-Semitism over the past 5 years, over one third indicate an increase, and 8% indicate a decrease (Table 29).

Table 27

Do you feel there is prejudice against Jews in Quebec?

Option	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Yes, a great deal	11.4	12.2
Yes, some	43.4	46.2
Yes, a bit	25.0	26.6
No, none	14.2	15.1
Don't know	5.3	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Table 28

Do you feel there is more prejudice against Jews in Que. than elsewhere in Canada? Would you say....

Option	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Yes, much more	6.5	10.0
Yes, bit more	11.6	17.6
About the same	37.3	56.8
Little bit less	7.0	10.7
Much less	3.2	4.9
Don't know	19.8	Missing
Not Applicable	14.6	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Table 29

Over the last five years, has prejudice against Jews, increased, decreased, or remained the same in Quebec?

Option	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)
Increased	25.1	34.8
Decreased	6.1	8.4
Remained the same	39.6	54.9
There is none	1.4	1.9
Don't know	12.6	Missing
Not Applicable	15.2	Missing
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0

Is this level of perceived anti-Semitism to be considered as high or low? A 1970 survey of Toronto's Jewish households heads (Richmond, 1972) may be used for comparison. There, 49% of the sample claimed no personal anti-Jewish "discrimination" and no anti-Semitism generally; in our study, 51% of the sample claim no personal experience of anti-Semitism. In addition, 55%, perceive a "great deal" or "some" anti-Semitism in Quebec. This suggests a rather comparable degree of perceived anti-Semitism in 1978 Montreal and in 1970 Toronto. (It should be noted that the proportions of foreign born and holocaust survivors in both samples were equivalent). A more complete assessment would of course require current data on perceived anti-Semitism in Toronto.

Of particular interest is the question of whether anti-Semitism in Quebec is influenced by the Jewish links to the anglophone community. Our respondents outline their perceptions concerning the source of anti-Semitism.

First regarding anti-Semitism of French Quebecers, 39% of those responding feel francophones are prejudiced equally against Jews and other anglophones, 19% feel that there is more prejudice against Jews, and 41% feel there is more prejudice against anglophones.

Thus, to the extent that our respondents sense a distinction on the part of prejudiced French Quebecers, we find that they believe, by a two-to-one margin, that there is more prejudice against the English than against Jews.

When asked to assess the reasons behind the anti-Semitism of French Quebecers, 27% of those responding indicate that the prejudice was directed against "Jews as Jews". Forty-five percent identify the "Jews as wealthy," and 21%, "Jews identified with English," as prime reasons for this anti-Semitism. What is not known is whether Jewish perceptions of the sources of French anti-Semitism are indeed accurate. A minority of Jews feel that prejudice against Jews, among French Quebecers, is specifically an anti-Jewish sentiment. With regard to the perceived anti-Semitism of English Quebecers, our respondents identify the two main sources as "Jewish wealth" (46%) and "Jews as Jews" (48%).

ANALYSIS OF EMIGRATION

Likelihood of Emigration

Respondents were asked if they have ever "considered leaving Quebec to settle elsewhere?"

In view of the public concern over emigration of Jews, it is illustrative to note that 55% of the respondents have given no consideration to emigration from Quebec; 16%, or one sixth have given "a lot" and about 28% have given it a "little" consideration. We find that 1.4% of the sample have made "definite" plans to leave, while an additional 3.7% have "tentative" plans to leave. Thus many of those who have considered the idea of emigrating "a lot" have made neither definite nor tentative plans. Definite or tentative plans include finding a new job and/or residence. About 15% of the sample have read about or talked about job possibilities outside Quebec, and 12% of the sample have travelled outside of Quebec specifically to see if they would like to live elsewhere. (Among those who have given emigration some thought - 45% of the sample - 27% have travelled outside Quebec to investigate emigration possibilities.)

A second probabilistic approach to the question of emigration was explored. Respondents were asked "the chances of your moving out of Quebec in the next five years". Regardless of thought given, or any plans made, we find in Table 30 2.6% claiming they will "definitely" have emigrated in five years, and another 9.3% who feel they will "probably" be gone in five years. This means that some persons who have as yet not made definite or tentative plans, feel they will emigrate

within 5 years. This figure of 11.9% compares with the 15.8% who have given emigration "a lot" of consideration. Still, the large majority of our respondents, believe they will be in Quebec in five years. One should add that 11% of the respondents indicate a "don't know" response. This may reflect either an honest ambivalence - or uncertainty with regard to developments in five years which might determine their actions.

Table 30

Likelihood of Emigration under Different Conditions

Chances of moving out of Quebec in the next five years	No scenario (status quo.)	Clear rejection of independence in referendum	Clear support of independence in referendum
Definitely Leave	2.6	2.1	21.6
Probably Leave	9.3	6.5	28.0
Probably Not Leave	39.9	27.7	19.8
Definitely Not Leave	34.9	56.2	16.1
Don't know	11.1	6.8	13.5
Not Applicable/no answer	2.3	0.6	0.9
TOTAL	100.0 (657)	100.0 (657)	100.0 (657)

Two other questions were designed to test the impact of alternate scenarios. Respondents were asked the same questions, but with the assumption that the referendum would either "strongly support" or "clearly reject" independence. A clear rejection of an independence referendum would, not surprisingly, reduce the likelihood of emigration, as seen in Table 30. It would also resolve some doubts among the

"don't knows". About 8.6% would estimate they might still emigrate, however, notwithstanding the defeat of the independence option. More striking is the response pattern should "clear support" for independence emerge from the referendum. We find 22% claiming they would definitely leave, and another 28% claiming they would probably leave. These represent large increases over the "status quo" responses. One sixth indicate they would "definitely not leave."

One note of caution should be sounded. First, the scenarios are described in rather extreme terms, to clarify the case for the respondent. It seems unlikely that the wording/results of the referendum will lend themselves to such a clear interpretation. Moreover, there can be discrepancies between declared intentions and subsequent behavior: not all of those who say they will leave, will do so. Still, the magnitude of the change in the different scenarios suggests that the preconditions for substantial emigration exist, should any serious change in the status quo occur in the direction of independence for Quebec. Thus, the referendum scenarios can serve as proxy measures of the volatility of the emigration propensity in the community, while suggesting the importance of the referendum to this propensity.

Finally, it should be noted that the responses described above refer only to those present in Montreal, and we have no information on those persons who may have emigrated previously.

As seen in the Table 31, there seems to be a clear association of age with likelihood of emigration. Under "status quo" assumptions, younger (under 40) respondents are at least three times more likely to emigrate than older respondents (over 65). Twenty percent of the

respondents under 40 indicate they will definitely or probably leave within five years. This figure reaches 70% under the second scenario.

Table 31

Likelihood of Emigration

By Age & Sex of Respondents

	Age N=569*		Sex N=568*	
1. Status Quo.	less than 40	65+	M	F
Definitely Leave	4.2	1.1	3.6	1.3
Probably Leave	15.5	5.5	10.8	10.5
Probably Not Leave	64.1	22.1	48.0	40.5
Definitely Not Leave	16.2	71.3	37.6	47.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2. Referendum shows clear support for independence.	N=562*		N=560*	
Definitely Leave	29.9	13.9	27.1	19.9
Probably Leave	41.5	24.7	33.6	30.1
Probably Not Leave	23.1	21.7	22.2	26.0
Definitely Not Leave	5.4	39.8	17.1	24.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Those indicating don't know/no answer are omitted.

This finding affirms the fact that younger persons generally are more mobile than older persons, and that the Jewish aged in Montreal, perhaps due to Medicare and other institutional arrangements, are more reluctant to leave. The significant age difference in intentions may

be seen as important, particularly as regards the demographic future of the community. The sex differences in the response patterns are realtively insignificant, as seen in Table 31.

Perceived Anti-Semitism and Emigration

It was possible to assess the role of perceived anti-Semitism in motivating Jewish emigration from Quebec. Popular assessment of this issue may confuse it with the factor of general political and economic dissatisfaction, in the province. Two indexes were devised to measure these traits - the first is called an "optimism" index, and combines responses to 4 questions about attitudes to political and economic developments in the province, with a high score denoting more optimism or satisfaction. The second is an anti-Semitism index, and combines responses to 4 questions about perceptions of anti-Semitism in Quebec. A high score denotes greater perceived anti-Semitism. (The Cronbach reliability coefficients are .66 for the first index and .52 for the second index). The indexes can be collapsed into three categories - high, medium, and low, corresponding roughly to the top third, middle third, and bottom third of the respondents. We can now analyze those scoring high and low on these indexes by likelihood of emigration.

The data in Table 32 clearly demonstrate the association of both general optimism and perceived anti-Semitism with attitudes on future emigration. Those scoring high on optimism and low on anti-Semitism are less likely to emigrate than those scoring low on optimism and high on anti-Semitism. The pattern holds for both scenarios - though it is more pronounced for the second one, of support for independence in the referendum.

Table 32

Likelihood of Emigration by Optimism Index and Anti-Semitism Index

Likelihood of Emigration	Optimism		Anti-Semitism*	
	High	Low	High	Low
1. Status Quo.				
Definitely leave	0	5.4	4.2	2.4
Probably leave	7.7	10.1	14.7	7.6
Probably not leave	45.8	50.0	48.4	40.6
Definitely not leave	46.4	34.5	32.6	49.4
	100.0 N=155	100.0 N=168	100.0 N=190	100.0 N=170
2. Referendum shows Clear Support for Independence				
Definitely leave	12.3	35.9	31.7	18.9
Probably leave	24.6	35.9	37.6	26.6
Probably not leave	37.0	15.0	17.7	26.6
Definitely not leave	26.0	13.2	12.9	27.8
	100.0 N=146	100.0 N=167	100.0 N=186	100.0 N=186

*The reader will note that a high score on anti-Semitism means a high perception of anti-Semitism, and this might corelate more with a low score of optimism.

Table 33 presents the reasons for possibly leaving Quebec, for those respondents who have considered it either "a lot" or "a little". Respondents described their reasons in their own words (open-ended questions) which were then grouped in appropriate categories. As seen clearly in the table, the two major factors in motivating possible emigration are a general political opposition, reflected by "fear of separatism" and "oppose Quebec government," accounting for over 35%,

and an economic motivation, accounting for 19% of the first choice reasons. Not all the reasons given are related clearly to current political and economic developments. Seven percent of the respondents indicate "health" or "climate" as a first reason for possible emigration. Five percent indicate a "family" or "personal" tie, such as close relations living elsewhere.

Table 33

Reasons for Leaving Quebec

Reasons	First Choice Adjusted Frequency	Second Choice Adjusted Frequency
Economic Conditions	19.3	24.4
Language laws	5.5	10.1
Prejudice Against Anglos	2.4	5.0
Anti-Semitism	5.5	4.2
Family, personal tie	5.2	3.4
Fear of separatism	12.1	5.0
Oppose Quebec government	23.1	14.3
Health, climate	7.2	10.9
Other	19.7	22.7
	100.0 N=290	100.0 N=119*

*not all respondents identified two reasons.

Only 5% of the respondents answering list anti-Semitism as either a first or second reason for their considering leaving Quebec. The primary reasons are economic and political in a general sense (including prejudice against Anglos and language laws). A subsequent question presented all respondents with a list of six possible reasons why

"some people would leave Quebec," and asked them to rank these in importance. Of those answering, 42% indicate the "general" or "personal" economic situation as most important; 32% list general political conditions, including Quebec's language laws as most important; 18% list the "possibility of anti-Semitism" as most important; 8% list "friends and relatives living outside of Quebec." This pattern of responses again suggests a greater role of economic and general political factors, compared to anti-Semitism, in motivating emigration.

It is still possible that the reasons outlined in Table 33 are interrelated. Respondents who perceive more anti-Semitism are also more likely to be dissatisfied with developments in Quebec, as seen by a significant statistical corelation between the optimism and anti-Semitism indices ($r=-.23$, $p \leq .001$).

Respondents who had not considered emigration at all (over 50% of the sample) were asked "what things make you want to stay in Quebec?" One third of this group indicate they have "roots in Montreal." One sixth cite economic factors, 14% indicate they are "too old or tired" to move, 13% cite family or personal ties. One can conclude tentatively that the factors promoting emigration are broad, societal forces such as the economy, political conditions, and anti-Semitism; factors opposing emigration tend to be more personal in nature, revolving around a sense of rootedness, networks of family and friends, or the physical difficulties associated with emigration.

Contribution to the Combined Jewish Appeal

What impact might emigration have on the future intake of the Combined Jewish Appeal? Are "big givers" more likely to emigrate, compared to others? The designation of big givers as those giving over $500 is purely arbitrary, and can be considered simply as the top fifth of contributors. There is no clear pattern which emerges for every level of giving. However, focussing on those contributing $500 or over (about 21% of the givers), we can see in Table 34 that big givers are at least as likely to emigrate as the general population, under both scenarios. For the category of "definitely not leave" i.e., those most committed to staying Quebec, we note that big givers fall below the sample average for both scenarios, 27% to 40% and 10% to 19%. This suggests that "big givers" may be as likely to emigrate as are other respondents.

Ashkenazi and Sephardi Differences

The Sephardi community is predominantly francophone. One might wonder if the attitudes on emigration of this community would parallel those of the larger Ashkenazi community. We find that on the explicit likelihood to emigrate within five years, there are no significant differences between the two communities for both scenarios. Sephardim appear as likely as Ashkenazim to be in Montreal in five years. There does seem to be a difference, however, in the attitudes of the communities as measured by the optimism index. The Sephardim are much more likely to score "high" on the scale (55% to 25%) than are Ashkenazi respondents, and less likely to be "low" scorers or pessimists

(18% to 33%). This suggests that Montreal's Sephardi community has in general been more satisfied with developments in the province, than has the Ashkenazi community. Why then is there no significant difference in the emigration variable? Part of the reason may be the confounding factor of age, since it may be that the Ashkenazi community is more aged, and thus less mobile, than the Sephardi community. In other words, Sephardi emigration may be more a function of youth than dissatisfaction with Quebec (sometimes called "push factors"). Alternatively, it is possible that relative present satisfaction with affairs in Quebec simply need not preclude possible future emigration.

Language

One of the central issues debated in anglophone Montreal is the role of the ability to speak French in determining attitudes to new developments in Quebec. From Table 34, we see clearly that declared ability to speak French - "very well or fairly well" - does not seem to provide significantly different patterns of responses to likelihood of emigration. As seen in Table 33 earlier, language per se does not seem to play a major role as a factor for those considering leaving Quebec (selected as a first reason by 5.5% and a second by 10.1% of respondents). Thus it is not surprising that French-speaking ability has little effect on intentions to stay in Quebec. French-speaking ability is also not significantly associated with optimism or perceived anti-Semitism, which may help explain the lack of association with the likelihood of emigration.

Table 34

Likelihood of Emigration by Selected Characteristics

Likelihood	Total Sample	"Big Givers" ($500±)	French Speaking ability: very or fairly well
1. Status Quo.			
Definitely Leave	3.0	2.9	3.7
Probably Leave	10.7	10.6	10.8
Probably Not Leave	46.0	59.6	49.3
Definitely Not Leave	40.2	26.9	36.1
	100.0 N=569	100.0 N=104	100.0 N=296
2. Clear Support for Independence			
Definitely Leave	25.3	29.1	25.1
Probably Leave	32.7	34.9	33.9
Probably Not Leave	23.1	26.2	25.4
Definitely Not Leave	18.9	9.7	15.6
	100.0 N=562	100.0 N=103	100.0 N=295

Occupation

As seen from the Table 35, likelihood of emigration varies for different census occupational categories. These differences are best seen in the responses to the "definitely leave" or "not leave" option and the categories of "manager-administrator" or "professional-technical," compared with "service/skilled labor." The basic finding is that the former groups are more likely to leave and less likely to stay. Thus, under the status quo assumption, 31% and 29% of the first two

"high status" groups are definitely staying compared to 47% of the skilled labour group. Under the second scenario, of support for independence in the referendum, 32% of the managers-administrators but only 15% of the service-skilled labour would "definitely" leave; 12% and 33% would "definitely" stay. Again, those with higher occupational status seem slightly more likely to emigrate.

Table 35

Emigration by Selected Census Occupational Group

Leave in Five Years	Census Categories					
	Managers Administrators	Professional Technical	Clerical	Sales	Service Skilled Labour	Total Sample
Status Quo						
Definitely Leave	4.3	1.2	3.2	1.7	1.3	3.0
Probably Leave	14.2	10.6	14.3	6.8	8.0	10.7
Probably Not Leave	50.2	58.8	47.6	47.5	28.0	46.0
Definitely Not Leave	31.3	29.4	34.9	44.1	47.0	40.2
N=	211	85	63	59	75	494
Support for Independence Referendum						
Definitely Leave	31.6	21.7	29.5	35.7	14.9	25.3
Probably Leave	35.4	31.5	32.8	23.2	32.8	32.7
Probably Not Leave	20.6	35.9	19.7	17.9	13.4	23.1
Definitely Not Leave	12.4	10.9	18.0	23.2	32.8	18.9
N=	209	92	61	56	67	486

Partly, this can be explained by the age differential in the categories. The first two categories have greater proportions of younger respondents than do the categories of service-skilled labour, or sales. Thus, emigration in the future is likely to be more

concentrated among the younger respondents who are likely to have higher educational attainment and occupational status.

Estimating the Size of the Jewish Community

Tha data available to this point allow rough estimation of the size of the Jewish community, by our definition. The number of households in the master file was 35,792. However, .2% were businesses or organizations; an estimated .1% were deceased as of the time of the construction of the list; an estimated 2.5% had definitely or probably left Montreal at the time of the list construction. Of the total of 1,166 households which were selected for the sample, 28 non-Jews were discovered during the verification by the survey staff and 15 by the CROP field staff (Table 3) yielding an estimated percentage of 3.7% non-Jews. (Most of the non-Jews may have come from the large Y.M.H.A. list; the Y director guessed that 5% of his membership were non-Jewish. Other non-Jews may have originated from the C.J.A. list, which includes some non-Jews.) Also there is an estimated 0.2% duplication in the list.

From Table 2, 7.4% of the sample were not traced in any way, and no information was available as a basis for reasoned guesses. Three different estimates of total number of households will be made, using three assumptions: (1) all were in Montreal; (2) none was in Montreal; (3) about one/half were in Montreal. Taking all factors into account except cases of no information, there is an estimated 6.8% of the master file that is not eligible for inclusion in the universe, reducing the figure of 35,739 to 33,308. Assuming all 7.4% are in Montreal, 33,300

(rounding) is an upper limit for the number of Jewish households in our "master list". Assuming not one of these was in Montreal, we have a figure of 30,800. Assuming one half these not-traceables in the city, we estimate 32,050 Jewish households.

One manner of checking this estimate is by comparison with the 1971 census. The census definition is necessarily more inclusive, but it is nevertheless instructive to compare the two. In 1971 the census estimate for the number of Jewish households in Montreal was about 36,400 (under the "religious" definition). We can estimate average household size in our sample, to derive population estimates. In 1971, average household size for Metropolitan Montreal was 3.3 persons per household: average size for Jewish households in 1971 was 2.95. If in 1976, average Jewish household size is again 10% below that of Montreal as a whole (as in 1971), we can estimate Jewish household size to average 2.7 persons per household, since the average for all Montreal households in 1976 was 3.0. (Household size should not be confused with family size; the latter is generally larger than the former. Households include dwellings occupied by single persons, and such persons would be heads of households, and not family persons.)

One final set of minor adjustments may be made based on the results of the actual fieldwork described in Table 3. Our best guess is that the range of Jewish households expressed in our universe of sampled households is between 30,000 and 32,500. It is this range which is our estimate of the Jewish community, 1978. Thus the master list of Jewish households in the community includes between 82-89% of the potential maximum, according to census definitions. Multiplying

by an estimated 2.7 persons per household, we obtain a population range of 81,000 to 87,750. Multiplying by the 1971 figure of 2.95 gives a population range of 88,500 to 95,875.

Given the number of Jewish households on our list, how many households were there in fact in Montreal? Here, one requires some estimate of the number of households omitted from the universe. The population subgroups either excluded or underrepresented are:

1. Fully assimilated households. Such households would be registered as Jewish by the census (either as religion or ethnic origin), yet have no ties to the community. Such families might include some with intermarried household heads, or those in the artistic community. We have no estimate of the size of this group in 1978.

2. Hasidic groups. As seen in Table 1, our master list included 90 Lubavitch families. Yet experts on Montreal Hasidim estimate a total Hasidic population of 450-500 families. Other Hasidic groups refused to cooperate with the survey; thus approximately 350-400 families (households) were omitted.

3. Sephardic and particularly francophone households. The completed survey yielded 7.3% of the respondents born in North Africa, 7.6% with French or Arabic mother tongue, and a total of 11% of Sephardic background. If these households are shown to have more members than average, they would correspond to higher proportions of the Jewish population. For a variety of reasons some of these families may have not yet affiliated formally with community institutions.

4. Newly established households with young households heads.

Such groups would include newly-weds, young adults moving out from their parents' home, recent migrants to Montreal who would by-pass J.I.A.S., and others. These households may well affiliate in the future, particularly after marriage or the arrival of children. Efforts were made to find such new household heads (for example, the C.J.A. monitors all Jewish marriages in Montreal, getting synagogue records and incorporating the information into the C.J.A. prospect list). Still, we believe that a certain number could have been omitted (note that such new households are created at a steady rate). We have no way of estimating the size of this group, particularly since it is precisely from this age group that most of the out-migration may well have taken place, from the date of the last census in 1971.

It is thus impossible to estimate the number of Jewish households in Montreal at the present time. Even with the universe of the survey (ie. the Jewish "community"), only an estimated range can be given, based on assumptions on non-traceable households. For these households falling outside the universe, estimates are all the more unreliable. There is no substitute for a complete census.

Many persons tend to confuse the issue of population growth (or decline) with that of migration. The factors affecting Jewish population size in Montreal (and in North America) are:

1. Fertility. Jewish fertility, always below general fertility, is declining. This declining fertility is associated with delay of marriage, divorce, as well as decisions by young couples to limit family size. American estimates place it at 30% below the rate for whites (which is now just at replacement level).

2. Age structure. The high concentration of elderly Jews reduces the growth potential of the population as a whole, independent of the rate of fertility. The age structure of the Montreal Jewish community has limited potential for rapid growth. This produces a relatively higher crude death rate and a lower crude birth rate, which reduces natural increase. In 1976, for all Montreal, household heads over 65 represented 13.5% of all heads; those between 25-34 were 24.6%. In our sample, the corresponding proportions were 31.4% (65±) and 14.1% (25-34).

3. Intermarriage. Marriages between Jews and non-Jews in which the non-Jewish partner does not convert to Judaism have been increasing at about 1% per year since the 1960's, and are now approximately 25% in Canada. The Quebec rate is substantially lower than this rate, yet by 1978 the cumulative effect of intermarriage may constitute a net loss to the community.

4. Net-migration or the combined effect of in-migration and out-migration. Our data show that migration of adult Jews (households heads) from Montreal is likely to be low if the political situation remains as at present. But evidence suggests that younger Jews are emigrating at a greater rate than older adults.

The age structure, the declining fertility, and the emigration of young Jews are reflected in the proportions of young children in Jewish households. We can compare 1971 census data to our own survey, and look at the ratio of households to children, for every age group of children, seen in Table 36. The higher the ratio of households per child, the lower the potential for future growth. In 1971, there were an average of 5.76 Jewish households for every child between 0-4

years of age; in 1978 there were 8.76 households. Note that the ratios even out as we move to the older age cohorts of the children, 10-19. In other words, there are fewer younger households in 1978, producing fewer younger children, aged 0-9.

Table 36

Ratio of Jewish Households to Children

Age cohort of children	Households per child	
	1971 (census)	1978 (JCRI)
0-4	5.76	8.76
5-9	4.85	6.14
10-14	4.37	4.32
15-19	3.74	3.89

For the youngest age group, 0-4, we see that the ratio was increased by one half, from 1971 to 1978. This is due to the combined impact of age structure, lower fertility, and out-migration of younger Jews.

Emigration of the Children of the Respondents

Our sample of 657 household heads claim 791 children aged 18 or over among them. These children were identified by their current residence and probable location in five years time-in the opinion of their parents (the respondents). As seen from the flow chart below, 34% of these children, the next biological generation, are not living in Montreal. Of these, 89% will either definitely or probably not return to Montreal in 5 years. Of 66% living in Montreal, 25% will

definitely or probably not remain five years hence. Combining the data, one can estimate that 46% of these children will not be in Montreal in 1983.

This out-migration, in combination with fertility and mortality rates, and in-migration, will determine the population size of the Montreal Jewish community in the years to come. The figures outlined above represent parental estimates of their children's intentions, and therefore may be treated with some caution. Still, it seems that barring upswings in fertility, or substantial Jewish immigration to Montreal, the continuation of out-migration of such dimensions will substantially reduce the future size of the Jewish community in the long run. The effect of this generational out-migration will become more noticeable towards the end of the 1980's.

In and of itself, an out-migration of between 1/3 and 1/2 of a biological generation may not be atypical for large Jewish communities in metropolitan areas in North American, particularly, in a post-war era highlighted by growing educational attainment and geographic and occupational mobility. We do not have comparable out-migration rates for Jewish communities in other urban centres in North America.

Traditionally, such out-migration may well have been balanced by substantial in-migration, either from smaller or other North American cities and towns, or from foreign countries. Given a relatively substantial outflow of Jews (children of our respondents), it is the volume of in-migration of Jews to Montreal which will be of major importance in the future.

Flowchart

Children 18 +

Current Residence

Living in Montreal
5 Years Hence
(Parental estimate)

Total # 18 +
791

Montreal
(523 = 66%)

	%	%
Definitely not (35)	9	7
Probably not (63)	16	12
Probably (194)	49	37
Definitely (102)	26	20
DK/NA (129)		25

Outside Montreal
(268 = 34%)

Come to Montreal
in Next 5 Years

	%	%
Definitely not (166)	71	62
Probably not (42)	18	16
Probably (17)	7	6
Definitely (9)	4	3
DK/NA (34)		13

Additional analysis of the information on the children of respondents illuminates the generational pattern. Of the total number of children over 18 covered by our sample, 32% are between 18-24, 18% between 25-29, 18% between 30-34 and 31% are 35 and over.

We find that among the oldest age group, (35+), 69% reside in Montreal; 50% of these 30-34, 61% of these 25-29, and 74% of these 18-24, reside in Montreal. There is no consistent pattern, with the youngest and oldest age groups having the highest proportions residing in the city.

It seems likely that the factors accounting for the high proportion of children residing in Montreal for the youngest and oldest age grouping are quite different. The oldest group of children, ranging in age from 35 to 64, are a settled, established group, of whom 71% are working and 25% are homemakers. Many have spent years developing careers and raising families in the Montreal area. Among children aged 18-24, we find 67% who are full time students, with 28% working (a few are homemakers or unemployed). The question of interest is whether these full-time students will decide to remain, and establish themselves in Montreal once their studies have been completed.

Looking at those children no longer residing in Montreal, we might ask how many years they have been away. For example, what proportion have left following the 1976 victory of the Parti Québécois, roughly 2 years before the date of the survey fieldwork? For the youngest age group, we find that 67% of those residing outside Montreal left in 1976 or after (have been gone for 2 years or less); 33% of those 25-29; 22% of those 30-34; and 13% of those 35 and over.

It is difficult to make any meaningful assessments concerning the young age groups, since their very youth makes it likely that they could only have left Montreal in the recent past. Such people would have left to attend college, do graduate work, or just after completing studies in Montreal, accounting for the high proportions of recent emigrants.

A better indication of the trend in emigration might be attained by looking at those 68 children 30-34, and those 70 children 35 and over, no longer in Montreal. Table 37 records the proportions of the total group who emigrated from Montreal in successive, two year periods beginning in the present. For the group now 30-34, we see that over one fifth (22%) of those no longer in Montreal left in the period 1976-78, an increase in the usual two year rate. For the group 35+, we find that 13% of this group left in the period 1976-1978, a percentage greater than that departing in most of the other 2 year intervals. (Because of the small sub-samples involved, these percentages must be treated with caution.) This is insufficient evidence on which to draw firm conclusions concerning increases or decreases in the rate of out-migration of older, established Jews. The increases for 1976-78, are only suggestive.

Looking at those children still in Montreal, we can evaluate the likekihood of their emigration, for different age categories. From the flow chart, we recall that about 25% of <u>all</u> children over 18 in Montreal were expected to either definitely or probably not be residing to Montreal in five years. Table 38 summarizes the breakdown by age category, for children residing in Montreal.

Table 37

Period of Emigration
of those Children of Respondents
not Residing in Montreal by
Age Group

	Age Group	
	35+	30-34
1976-78	12.8%	22.1%
74-76	1.4%	11.8%
72-74	4.3%	16.2%
70-72	5.7%	16.2%
68-70	8.6%	16.2%
66-68	1.4%	13.2%
64-66	4.3%	**
62-64	7.1%	
60-62	8.6%	
58-60	10.0%	
56-58	2.9%	
54-56	0	
52-54	4.3%	
50-52	1.4%*	

*comprises 73% of the group; the remainder emigrating even earlier.

**comprises 96% of the group; the remainder emigrating even earlier.

Table 38

Per Cent of Children over 18 Now Resident in Montreal, likely to be in Montreal 5 years hence (according to Parental estimates), by Age Group*

Age Group of Children	Definitely or Probably not in Montreal	Definitely or Probably in Montreal
18-24	35%	65%
25-29	29%	71%
30-34	14%	86%
35+	17%	83%

*Excludes responses of don't know, no answer.

Parents anticipate a higher rate of emigration among their children in the two youngest groups, compared to the two oldest age groups. Parental estimates are that few (17%) of their children over 35 will leave Montreal in five years. For those in the age group 18-24, expectations are higher - 35% for the group as a whole, and 39% for those who are students. Thus, those children most likely to leave Montreal within five years are, according to parental estimates, are of younger age and of student status. Older children, more established in Montreal, are considered less likely to emigrate.

Conclusion: Emigration

The salient conclusions regarding out-migration of Jews are as follows:

1. We do not know how many Jewish persons have left Montreal over the past few years. The sample survey did not attempt to locate persons living outside the geographic area of interest.

2. The survey found very few adult respondents with either definite or tentative plans for emigrating from Quebec. Over half the respondents have never considered leaving Quebec.

3. It is probable that a referendum result in favor of independence or some variant of independence, or some other event propelling the province to greater autonomy, might substantially increase the likelihood of emigration from the province.

4. The younger respondents (under 40) are more likely to emigrate under all scenarios. Looking at the older (18+) children of our respondents, the next biological generation, approximately one third are currently not living in Montreal, and somewhat under one half are likely to be living outside Montreal in five years, in the estimation of parents. The younger children of the respondents are considered more likely to emigrate than the older children.

5. The main reasons given for possible emigration out of the province are political and economic concerns, and not direct fears of anti-Semitism.

6. Neither knowledge of French, nor Sephardi or Ashkenazi origin, is associated with the likelihood of emigration in five years. However Sephardi respondents are less dissatisfied with current political developments in Quebec, than are Ashekenazi respondents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bock, Geoffry E. "The Jewish Schooling of American Jews: A Study of Non-Cognitive Educational Effects." Harvard University, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1976.

Elazar, Daniel J. Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry. Phyladelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1976.

Fishman, Joshua. Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1966.

Fowler, Floyd J. 1975 Community Survey: A Study of the Jewish Population of Creater Boston. Boston: Combined Jewish Phalanthropies, 1977.

Himmelfarb, Harold. "The non-linear impact of schooling: comparing different types and amounts of Jewish education," Sociology of Education, 42: 1140129, 1977.

Richmond, Anthony. Ethnic Residential Segregation in Toronto. Toronto: York University, 1972.

Sklare, Marshall. The Jewish Community in America. New York: Benrman House, 1974.

Sklare, Marshall. The Jews in American Society. New York: Benrman House, 1974.